

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks.

The Applicants wish to thank Patent Examiner Victor Mac Arthur for the many courtesies extended to the undersigned attorney during the Personal Interview on December 21, 2005, at the U.S.P.T.O. The substance of this Personal Interview is set forth in the Examiner Interview Summary, and in this Amendment.

The amendments to the claims are as follows. Claims 7 and 14 were objected to because "the claiming effect" in each claim lacks a proper antecedent basis. Therefore, this was replaced with "a clamping effect." Withdrawal of this formal objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the shaft-hub connection comprises an attachment flange (1) having a hub-sleeve element (3) with a radially outermost surface that is conical. This structure is not disclosed in any prior art reference.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite that there are at least two bushings (4) positioned radially between said first part (3.1) of the hub-sleeve element and said another part (3.2) of the hub-sleeve element to take up a slip torque and the bushings are contacting one another in the axial direction; wherein said first part (3.1) of the hub-sleeve element (3) extends over the length of said at least two bushings (4), in contact therewith; and wherein the level of the slip torque which is to be taken by said bushing can be preset by adjusting a bolt (5) which connects the attachment flange (1) with the clamping element (6).

The prior art fails to disclose this structure, as claimed.

The Patent Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, 12, 14 and 15 as being anticipated by the newly cited *Müllenberg* (U.S. Patent No. 4,268,185).

During the Personal Interview, it was pointed out to the Patent Examiner that there was a misinterpretation of some elements of the mounting attachment disclosed by *Müllenberg* in the Office Action. For example, the Patent Examiner states that *Müllenberg* discloses in FIG. 4 "a shaft-hub connection comprising an attachment flange (left 55) having a hub-sleeve element (hub-

sleeve portion of left 55) with a conical region (conical region of left 55); a clamping element (right 55) which is attachable to the attachment flange and by means of which a shaft end (2) assigned to the attachment flange is connectable by frictional connection to the attachment flange..."

However, as a matter of fact, FIG. 4 of *Müllenberg* shows a double clamping assembly 50 wherein the reference number 55 denotes two outer taper rings. There is no disclosure in *Müllenberg* which states that reference number 55 denotes an "attachment flange" as argued by the Patent Examiner. A person skilled in the art has a clear understanding about the form of an "attachment flange". That is the reason why *Müllenberg* has called the element 55 "outer taper ring" and not "flange" or "attachment flange". Thus, reference number 55 does not denote an "attachment flange" but an outer taper ring. Moreover, if reference number 55 would denote an "attachment flange" then both outer taper rings (left 55 and right 55) would each be an "attachment flange". However, the Patent Examiner states that the left outer taper ring is an "attachment flange (left 55)" while the other outer taper ring (right 55) is "a clamping element (right 55) which is attachable to the attachment flange".

This is respectfully submitted to be a contradiction in terminology that teaches away from the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the Patent Examiner argues that in FIG. 4 of *Müllenberg* "the hub-sleeve element" (i.e. hub-sleeve portion of left 55) "is under the clamping effect of the clamping element" (i.e. right 55). However, as a matter of fact, the left outer taper ring 55 has no hub-sleeve element which is under a clamping effect of the "clamping element" (i.e. the right outer taper ring 55).

During the Personal Interview, the above-noted revisions were made to claims 7 and 14 in order to overcome the Patent Examiner's objections. Also, claims 16 and 17 were amended to be consistent with claim 14 as amended. In claims 7 and 14 it was pointed out that the conical region of the hub-sleeve element (3) or the first part (3.1) is a conical outer surface region. This feature is clearly shown in the drawings of the present application and is also disclosed in the present Specification on Page 3 in lines 17 to 18 ("on its outer surface facing the clamping ring 6"... "the surface of the hub element is greased in its conical region").

In addition, amended claim 14 includes the feature that the first part (3.1) of the hub-sleeve element (said first part 3.1 having a conical outer surface region) extends over the length of the bushing (4). This feature is shown in FIG. 2 and also disclosed in the present Specification on Page 4 in line 26.

The deficiencies in the teachings of the primary reference to *Mullenberg* are not overcome by the disclosure of the secondary references to *Clifton* and to *Richardson*.

Clifton, U.S. Patent No. 5,599,129 in column 2, lines 6 to 13, discloses providing a load limited connector which incorporates a structure which is designed and calibrated to fail at a predetermined approximately tensile load. *Clifton* also provides a load limited connector that may be calibrated to fail at different predetermined approximate tensile loads so that it may be used in a variety of different applications. Thus, *Clifton* is nonanalogous prior art.

Richardson, U.S. Patent No. 5,970,932 in column 1, lines 32 to 40, recites a panhead style rocker arm assembly that has a rocker arm with a solid cylindrical section. A pushrod level extends perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the solid

cylindrical section and is attached to a first end of the solid cylindrical section. A valve lever extends from a second end of the solid cylindrical section. A bushing matingly fits around the solid cylindrical section. A pair of guides fit over the bushing and attach to a cylinder head. Thus, *Richardson* is nonanalogous prior art.


Thus, none of the references cited by the Patent Examiner teaches or suggests a shaft-hub connection according to amended claim 7 or amended claim 14.

For all the reasons set forth above, no prior art reference provides an identical disclosure of the claimed invention. Hence, the present invention is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102. Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

For all these reasons, all the claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over all the prior art applied by the Patent

Examiner. A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Rudolf WEISS, R et al




COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

ERF:lgh

Enclosure: Copy of Petition for 3 month Extension of Time
(Small Entity)

Allison C. Collard, Reg.No.22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298
William C. Collard, Reg.No. 38,411
Attorneys for Applicant

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 12, 2006.



Kelly Espitia